



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,589	04/04/2006	Masahisa Kawashima	286666US40PCT	3967
22850	7590	03/26/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			KRISHNAN, VIVEK V	
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2145	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/574,589	KAWASHIMA ET AL.
	Examiner VIVEK KRISHNAN	Art Unit 4121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 18-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 18-34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 18-34 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/OS/02/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date April 4, 2006

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a Non-Final Office Action Correspondence in response to U.S. Application No. 10/574589 filed on April 4, 2006, claiming a U.S. National Stage entry under 35 U.S.C. 371 of International Application PCT/JP04/15126, filed on October 14, 2004, which claims priority to Japanese Patent Application No. 2003-358427, filed on October 17, 2003. Claims 18-34 are pending.

Examiner acknowledges receipt of Preliminary Amendment/Remarks filed on April 4, 2006.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 18-34 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The terms "destination", "recipient address", "transmission source", "originator address", and "reply destination address", as recited in the claims, should be clearly defined and their usage in the claims should be consistent. Although the meanings of these terms have been interpreted for the purposes of examination, these terms lack concrete and distinct definitions.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 18, 25, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,216,227 B2 to Grynberg.

10. Regarding Claims 18, 25, and 30, Grynberg discloses a mail delivery system, mail delivering method, and mail delivering program (referenced hereinafter as the system) that receives an alias mail having an alias address different from a recipient address as a destination and replaces the destination with the recipient address to transfer the alias mail and receives a reply mail responding to the alias mail and replaces the recipient address with the alias address as a transmission source of the reply mail to transfer the reply mail, the mail delivery system comprising:

an alias mail processing unit that restores, when an alias mail having an alias address generated from the recipient address and a predetermined generation argument as a destination is received, the recipient address and the generation argument from the alias address, replaces the destination of the alias mail with the recipient address, and includes the generation argument in the alias mail to transfer to alias mail (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses decrypting the alias address, or encoded string, to produce the recipient address and generated argument, and replaces the alias address with the recipient address to transfer the mail); and

a reply mail processing unit that acquires, when a reply mail responding to the alias mail transferred by the alias mail processing unit is received, the generation argument from the reply mail, regenerates the alias address from the generation argument and a recipient address

indicating a transmission source of the reply mail, and replaces the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address to transfer the reply mail (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses regenerating the alias address, or encoded string, from the generated argument and recipient address indicating a transmission source of the reply mail, and replacing the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 19-24, 26-29, and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grynberg as applied to Claims 18, 25, and 30 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,247 B1 to Sasyan et al. (hereinafter "Sasyan").

13. Regarding Claims 19, 26, and 31, Grynberg discloses each and every limitation of Claims 18, 25, and 30. Grynberg further discloses wherein the alias mail processing unit includes: a recipient address restoring unit that restores, when the alias mail is received, the recipient address and the generation argument from the alias address (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses restoring the recipient address and generated argument from the alias address, or encoded string);

Grynb erg does not explicitly disclose, however Grynberg, in further view of Sasyan, discloses a reply destination address generating unit that generates a reply destination address including the generation argument restored by the recipient address restoring unit and an originator address indicating a transmission source of the alias mail (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64, discloses replacing the source address with a virtual address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynb erg; columns 3-5, discloses generating an alias address, or encoded string, using a address and a generated argument);

an alias mail transfer unit that replaces the destination of the alias mail with the recipient address restored by the recipient address restoring unit and replaces the transmission source of the alias mail with the reply destination address generated by the reply destination address generating unit to transfer the alias mail (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64, discloses replacing the destination with the actual recipient address and replacing the source with the virtual address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynb erg; columns 3-5, discloses replacing the destination with the recipient address), and

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify an alias mail processing unit, as disclosed by Grynberg, to include replacing the originator address with an alias address, as disclosed by Sasyan, in order to appropriately accommodate for reply messages (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64)

Grynb erg discloses the reply mail processing unit includes: an alias address regenerating unit that regenerates the alias address from the generation argument restored by the originator address restoring unit and the recipient address indicating the transmission source of the reply

mail (Grynb erg; columns 3-5, discloses regenerating the alias address from a generation argument and the recipient address indicating the transmission source of the reply mail); and

Grynb erg does not explicitly disclose, however Grynb erg, in further view of Sasyan, discloses an originator address restoring unit that restores, when the reply mail is received, the originator address and the generation argument from the reply destination address that is a destination of the reply mail (Sasyan; column 8 lines 25-40, discloses restoring an originator address from the alias address indicating the reply destination address) (Grynb erg; columns 3-5, discloses restoring an original address from an alias address includes restoring a generated argument from the encoded string);

a reply mail transfer unit that replaces the destination of the reply mail with the originator address restored by the originator address restoring unit and replaces the transmission source of the reply mail with the alias address regenerated by the alias address regenerating unit to transfer the reply mail (Sasyan; column 8 lines 25-40, discloses replacing the destination of the reply mail with an actual address and replacing the source of the reply mail with a virtual address to transfer the reply) (Grynb erg; columns 3-5, discloses replacing the transmission source of a reply mail with an alias recipient address).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify an alias mail processing unit, as disclosed by Grynb erg, to include replacing the originator address with an alias address, as disclosed by Sasyan, in order to appropriately accommodate for reply messages (Sasyan; column 7 lines 23-64)

14. Regarding Claims 20, 27, and 32, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claims 19, 26, and 31. Grynberg further discloses wherein the generation argument is information indicating transfer conditions that the alias mail transferred to the recipient should satisfy,

the alias mail processing unit further includes a transfer possibility judging unit that judges whether the alias mail satisfies transfer conditions restored by the recipient address restoring unit (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses judging whether the alias mail satisfies the restored transfer conditions included in the generated argument of the encoded string), and

the alias mail transfer unit transfers only an alias mail that is judged by the transfer possibility judging unit as satisfying the transfer conditions (Grynberg; columns 3-5, discloses only transferring alias mail that is judged as satisfying the transfer conditions).

15. Regarding Claim 21, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 20. Grynberg further discloses wherein the transfer conditions are transfer conditions that can be updated according to transfer of the alias mail,

the alias mail processing unit further includes a transfer conditions updating unit that updates, when it is judged by the transfer possibility judging unit that the transfer conditions are satisfied, the transfer conditions to generate the generation argument anew (Grynberg; column 4, discloses the generated argument in the encoded string including an updatable time stamp), and

the reply destination address generating unit generates a reply destination address including the generation argument generated anew by the transfer conditions updating unit instead of the generation argument restored by the recipient address restoring unit (Grynberg;

column 4, discloses using the updated generation argument in the encoded string including the time stamp rather than the old generation argument).

16. Regarding Claim 22, Grynberg and Sasyan in combination disclose each and every limitation of Claim 20. Grynberg further discloses wherein the transfer conditions are transfer conditions that can be updated according to reception of the alias mail,

the reply mail processing unit further includes a transfer conditions updating unit that updates the transfer conditions restored by the originator address restoring unit to generate the generation argument anew (Grynberg; column 4, discloses the generated argument in the encoded string including a time stamp updatable for every generated encoded string), and

the alias address regenerating unit regenerates an alias address including the generation argument generated anew by the transfer condition updating unit instead of the generation argument restored by the originator address restoring unit (Grynberg; column 4, discloses using the updated generation argument in the encoded string including the time stamp rather than the old generation argument).

17. Regarding Claims 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, and 34, Claims 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, and 34 have similar limitations to Claims 19-22. Therefore they are rejected under Grynberg and Sasyan for the same reasons as set forth in the rejections of Claims 19-22.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIVEK KRISHNAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VK

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145